



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/730,577	12/07/2000	Yasusi Kanada	Н-956	9644
24956 75	7590 04/27/2005		EXAMINER	
MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C. 1800 DIAGONAL ROAD			BATES, KEVIN T	
SUITE 370			. ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			2155	
		DATE MAILED: 04/27/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		. 09/730,577	KANADA, YASUSI			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Kevin Bates	2155			
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication app Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE M. - Extensi after SI. - If the pe - If NO pe - Failure Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. eriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, bly received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timy within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠ F	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 Fe</u>	ebruary 2005.				
2a)□ T	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositio	n of Claims					
4; 5)□ C 6)図 C 7)□ C	Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application. a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Applicatio	n Papers					
10)□ TI A R	the specification is objected to by the Examine the drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the deplacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Example.	epted or b) objected to by the Education of the Education of the Identity of the Identity of the Identity of the Identity of Identity of the Identity of Identity	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119		•			
a) 1 2 3	cknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau te the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s	•	0 <u></u>				
	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) 🛛 Informa	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date 12-6-04.		latent Application (PTO-152)			

4

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on February 3, 2005.

The Information Disclosure Statement was received on December 7, 2004.

Claims 1-5 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mohaban (6463470).

Regarding claim 1, Mohaban teaches a method of transmitting a policy rule, which describes a condition and an action (Column 16, lines 14-21), from a policy server to a network node that is connected to the policy server via a network (Column 11, lines 14-20), the method comprising the steps of: assigning a newly entered policy rule with an identifier (Column 19, lines 46-48; Column 20, lines 19-27); detecting a policy rule existing in a repository (Column 6, lines 7-12) that depend on the newly entered policy rule or on the newly entered policy rule depends transmitting the newly entered policy rule with the assigned identifier to said network node (Column 24, lines 24-28), wherein, if the detected policy rule has not been transmitted to said

Art Unit: 2155

network node, the identifier thereof and the condition and the action described therein are transmitted with the newly entered policy rule to said network node (Column 28. lines 32 – 38); and if the detected policy rule has been transmitted with the newly entered policy rule to said network node, the identifier thereof is transmitted to said network node, but the condition and the action described therein are not transmitted (Column 28, lines 40 - 41).

Regarding claim 2, Mohaban discloses the policy rules that if the detected policy rule has not been transmitted to said network node, the identifier thereof, the condition and the action described therein, and a first instruction that specifies network interface information on said network node to put the detected policy rule into action are transmitted to said network node; and if the detected policy rule has been transmitted to said network node, the identifier thereof and a second instruction that specifies network interface information on said network node to put the detected policy rule into action are transmitted to said network node (Column 24, lines 37 – 61).

Regarding claim 3, Mohaban discloses the steps of: retaining the policy rules transmitted to said network node in storage of said policy server; and checking the transmitted policy rules retained in said storage to see whether the policy rule that depends on the newly entered policy rule or on any of which a new policy rule depends, detected by said detection step, has been transmitted to said network node (Column 6, lines 5 - 12).

Regarding claim 4, Mohaban discloses said step of detecting a policy rule that depends on the newly entered policy rule or on any of which a new policy rule depends detects a policy rule that references a variable defined in said newly entered policy rule or a policy rule that defines a variable that is used as a condition in said newly entered policy rule (Column 21, lines 34 – 41).

Regarding claim 5, Mohaban discloses said network node is connected to a proxy server that converts the rule transmitted from said policy server into a rule in form that the converted rule can be executed on said network node and said network node receives the converted rules in this form (Column 12, lines 59 – 62).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 3, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the reference, Mohaban does not detect dependent policies. The examiner disagrees, the reference, Mohaban uses the words simple or complex policies to take note of whether a policy does have sub-policies that are dependent on it, and so if it checks whether the policy is complex or not, it is checking for dependencies (Column 24, lines 24 – 28; Table 4) so if a rule is fine, the system checks the SubPolicy attribute to determine whether there are other policies dependent or child nodes to the policy.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2155

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KB

KB April 22, 2005

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100